liability.

same function for the Kmart bankruptcy. Kmart is a knowing user of Mr. Berry's original works and Alix Partners, LLC sought to protect both of its clients, Kmart and Fleming by assisting in the criminal infringement of Mr. Berry's original works. Alix Partners, LLC knew or was willfully blind to the wrongful conduct. The actions of Michael Scott are imputed to Alix Partners, LLC under the theory of vicarious

- 91. The Declaration of Damian Capozzola filed in Delaware Bankruptcy Court on August 1, 2003, in ADV Proc. 03-54809 contained as Exhibit "R" a document signed on June 26, 2003 by Michael Scott, authorizing the payment to Guidance to perform the unlawful copying of Mr. Berry's original work and to later file false declaration in the bankruptcy court that were filed in the Capozzola declaration on August 1, 2003. The Declaration of Michael Gurzi that swore under penalty of perjury that he could verify that no Fleming employee had a copy of Mr. Berry's original work when Mark Dillon had told he might still have one.
- Alix Partners, LLC is liable for the acts of its principal and agent whose 92. commission of these wrongs were to the benefit of his principal.
- Fleming, Foodland, HTC, HEX, HEST, CALPAC, Christensen, Dillon, 93. Noa, Gurzi, Scott and C&S as co-conspirators are liable for all wrongs, including the wrongs of all Fleming subagents including the Fleming Employees and Graham

- Should Mr. Berry elect statutory damages, each defendant will be liable 94. for no more than \$150,000 per member of the conspiracy, for each work infringed times three under the Clayton Act.
- Fleming's liability is limited to the period from and after April 1, 2004 95. and plaintiff shall not seek to execute on any judgment without order of the Delaware Bankruptcy Court.

COUNT IV (MISAPPROPRIATION OF TRADE SECRETS)

- 96. Plaintiff restates the previous paragraphs that are incorporated by this reference.
- Fleming and C&S began to negotiate the sale of Fleming Wholesale 97. operations to C&S sometime in the Spring of 2003.
- 98. Upon information and belief, C&S learned that the Hawaii Fleming division had a monopoly over both the Civilian and the Military Wholesale grocery market.
- 99. Further, due the efficiencies of Mr. Berry's Freight Control System and the use of practices such as product diversions, the large profits earned by the Fleming-Logistics Department became material inducement for the C&S to acquire

the Fleming Wholesale Business.

- 100. To facilitate C&S ability to recreate the Fleming business model, C&S required the automation that was provide by the Berry Freight Control System and the trade secrets that were contained in the numerous other computer software programs developed by Mr. Berry and loaned, as an interim measure to Fleming while it was in the process of replacing these programs and the processes with ones to be supplied by Manugistics.
- 101. In deposition testimony, Mark Dillon testified that certain Web Pages what were developed by Mr. Berry remained on the Fleming system and have been used by HEX/HEST/CALPAC.
- 102. The Guidance Report contained a listing of certain files that evidence that no less than 30 of the other programs created by Mr. Berry remained on the Fleming server when it was sold to C&S.
- 103. These programs were illegally transferred to C&S when its became the owner and operator of the Fleming-Logistics Department.
- 104. This transfer was made by "improper means" including theft, bribery, misrepresentation, breach or inducement of a breach of a duty to maintain secrecy. or espionage through electronic or other means.
 - 105. This transfer constitutes "misappropriation" because C&S' attorney Mr.

Ziman and Fleming's attorney Mr. Liebeler and others knew that Mr. Berry had claims regarding his software, and appeared in the Delaware Bankruptcy Court on August 4, 2003, and misrepresented to the Bankruptcy Court that Mr. Berry's software was "not on the list" while knowing that they were intending to transfer Mr. Berry's trade secrets. These attorneys were under a duty of condor to the Bankruptcy court that makes any misstatement or attempt to deceive a misrepresentation. The Bankruptcy Court has entered findings that Fleming's counsel has committed repeated misrepresentations in regard to their conduct in the Delaware proceedings.

- 106. C&S, Guidance, Scott and Gurzi knew or had reason to know that the Berry trade secrets were acquired by improper means.
- 107. C&S, Guidance, Scott and Gurzi knew that the disclosure or use of Mr. Berry's trade secrets of was without his express consent.
- 108. C&S, Guidance, Scott and Gurzi knew that Fleming had used improper means to acquire knowledge of the trade secret or, at the time of disclosure or use, C&S knew or had reason to know that the knowledge of the trade secret was derived from or through a person who had utilized improper means to acquire it or acquired it under circumstances giving rise to a duty to maintain its secrecy or limit its use; or derived from or through a person who owed a duty to maintain its secrecy or limit its use.

- 110. Pursuant to Hawaii Rev. Stat. Plaintiff, is entitled to damages against C&S, Guidance, Scott and Gurzi and Fleming including both the actual loss caused by misappropriation and the unjust enrichment caused by misappropriation that is not taken into account in computing actual loss.
- 111. In lieu of damages measured by any other methods, the damages caused by misappropriation may be measured by imposition of liability for a reasonable royalty for a misappropriator's unauthorized disclosure or use of a trade secret.
- 112. C&S, Guidance, Scott and Gurzi, by participating in the fraud upon the Bankruptcy Court and evidenced by its hiring of Fleming's attorneys who had represented an adjudicated willful infringer, shows that its misappropriation was willful and malicious and therefore, Plaintiff shall seek an award of exemplary damages.

COUNT V (VIOLATION OF THE SHERMAN ACT AGAINST NON-DEBTOR DEFENDANTS.)

- 113. Plaintiff restates the preceding allegations that are incorporated by this reference.
- 114. Starting in or about the Winter of 2000, defendant Foodland initiated contact with Plaintiff. The stated purpose of the communication was to assess the amount of food overcharges that Foodland was paying Fleming and to "stop the bleeding."
- 115. Plaintiff proposed a computer software system that would allow Foodland to cease to use Fleming as its sole source of wholesale supply and to begin to operate as a independent logistics entity to avoid the additional charges that Fleming, and the HEX related entities were passing on to Foodland. overcharges are estimated to be between 10 to 25 %.
- 116. Foodland realized that Fleming's monopoly could permit the overcharges to be safely passed on the Hawaii consumers allowing Foodland to collect its percentage profit on a much higher total sales number figure.
- 117. Foodland also owns Fleming's warehouse in Kapolei that allows Foodland to recover some of the overcharges through its lease rent.
 - 118. Recognizing that Fleming operates a monopoly in the market defined as

the Hawaii wholesale grocery market, encompassing all sales of groceries in the geographic territory of the state of Hawaii, Foodland agreed to continue to allow Fleming and the HEX entities to overcharge it, under the agreement that the Fleming monopoly including the HEX entities would not allow any Foodland competitor to receive a better price. By virtue of the "Team Score" facility in the Fleming/Foodland sales agreements, Foodland, and Fleming have agreed to a rebate scheme that would allow both parties to enjoy the benefits of the Fleming monopoly.

- 119. To further enhance the Fleming monopoly, large mainland vendors have further caused Fleming to become the exclusive distributor of its products, thereby solidifying the Hawaii wholesale grocery monopoly.
- 120. The Berry Freight Control System, is necessary to the monopoly that facilities the overcharges to all Fleming customers. By creating false records that demonstrate that the military, Fleming's second largest customer, is being charged the same or less than Foodland, Fleming is able to continue its monopolistic activities. and succeed in effecting an approximate 25% overcharge of both the civilian and the military consumers in Hawaii. In addition, the assertion of ownership over the July 7, 2003, Dillon Derivative is intended to further the Fleming monopoly and further deprive Mr. Berry of a market for his software.
 - 121. Additionally, the Berry Freight Control System is used to track

commercial bribery and illegal rebating between HTC, HEX/HEST/CALPAC Fleming and the Doe Vendors who utilized freight charges and subsidies to facilitate the maintenance of the Fleming monopoly further used to effect price fixing for civilian and military food commodities in Hawaii. Money is exchanged between a variety of actors ,some of which yet to be discovered, that together comprises a combination and/or conspiracy to restrain trade in regard to Mr. Berry's software market defined as the market for ocean freight software sales in the geographic area comprised by the state of Hawaii and Guam.

- 122. Were these actors to pay and receive a license for the use of the software. that license would require payment based on volume of ocean containers moved through the system and would disclose the scope and extent of the Fleming monopoly.
- 123. But for the conspiracy with Foodland, and the HEX defendants, Fleming would not require the illegal use of Mr. Berry's Freight Control System to continue to operate its Hawaii monopoly. By allowing the Fleming co-conspirator to use Mr. Berry's software without payment to Mr. Berry limits Mr. Berry's ability to develop and to provide his software to other competitors of Fleming thereby reducing competition in the civilian and military wholesale grocery market. This injury is traceable to the anti-competitive conduct complained of herein.

- 124. All of the acts that are the subject of this complaint against Fleming or any of its agents, have been committed by Fleming after the filing of the Bankruptcy on April 1, 2003.
- 125. All of these acts have been committed with the specific intent to maintain the Fleming Hawaii market wholesale grocery monopoly with the hope to sell the Hawaii division to a new monopolist that would continue the earlier illegal practices including the infringement of Mr. Berry's intellectual property rights.
- 126. Alternatively, the conspiring defendants have attempted to create a monopoly and/or conspired to created a monopoly also in violation of the Sherman Act 18 U.S.C. § 2. Further, the use of Fleming and now C&S by mainland vendors effects a price fix over the wholesale and retail price of food in Hawaii and violates the Sherman Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1.
- 127. Plaintiff has been injured in his business and property by the agreement between C & S, Fleming and Foodland to sell the Hawaii division and continue to use illegal pirated versions of his software.
- 128. This agreement constitutes a restraint of trade and violates the laws of the United States and the State of Hawaii.
- 129. But for this illegal agreement, the C & S Defendants would have no reason to violate the Plaintiff's exclusive rights.

- 130. As a direct and proximate result of these acts, the Plaintiff has suffered injury in amounts to be determined at time of trial.
- 131. Pursuant to The Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1 & 2, and the Section 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S. C. § 15, Plaintiff is entitled to recovery treble damages from the non-debtor defendants for all damages proven.

COUNT VI (VIOLATIONS OF RICO AGAINST THE NON-BANKRUPTS)

- 132. Plaintiff re-alleges the preceding allegations that are incorporated by this reference.
- 133. The parties to the conspiracy to infringe are members of a Enterprise engaged in interstate shipment of goods through a pattern of racketeering. The individual defendant infringers are individually liable or if lacking criminal intent their acts were intentional as to their principal who directed it and therefore their continued membership in the conspiracy threatens to cause the Enterprise to continue.
- 134. Because Mr. Berry's freight control System is necessary to the success of the Enterprise the members have conspired to infringe as set forth herein.
- 135. Fleming has already been found by a jury to have committed the predicate act of wilful infringement in the period of 1999 to 2001 and the doctrine of collateral estoppel prevents the re-litigation of that issue. Each time the C&S system pirated version of the Berry software is used, another predicate offence occurs.

- 136. Fleming and C&S together along with the other defendants, conspired to create another illegal derivative of Plaintiff's Freight Control System in or about May 2003.
- 137. Based on RICO, Plaintiff names all defendants herein as RICO persons and seeks to impose RICO liability on all defendants except Fleming that is bankrupt. Fleming acts in furtherance of the conspiracy are imputed to the other conspirators.

(Violations of 18 U.S.C. §1962(c))

- 138. The RICO persons, including, but not limited to, Mark Dillon, Teresa Noa, Fleming, Gurzi, Guidance Software, LLC, Scott, C&S are persons employed by or associated with an enterprise engaged in interstate commerce and directly and/or indirectly conducted or participated in the conduct of that enterprise through a pattern of racketeering. These RICO Persons have engaged in activities affecting interstate or foreign commerce, and conducted or participated, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity in violation of RICO §1962(c), 18 U.S.C. §1962(c) as set forth herein.
- 139. Each RICO Person is legally distinct and separate from the Enterprise, which is an association in fact of these RICO Persons. This Enterprise was formed sometime in 1999 and continues as of this writing.

(Violations of 18 U.S.C. §1962(d))

- Defendant C&S became a member of a conspiracy as alleged 140. herein and, with the other members of the conspiracy agreed to conduct or participate in the affairs of the Enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity.
- Defendant C&S, knew that the object of the conspiracy was 141. conducted in violation of RICO 18 U.S.C. §1962 through repeated violations of 18 USC.
- 142. C&S and its attorneys knew that Fleming was engaged in copyright infringement but chose to allow the sale to proceed under the agreement that Fleming would deliver the pirated copy of Mr. Berry's original work or an illegal derivative.
- 143. At that time, C&S was aware of the existence of the Enterprise and it agreed that the Enterprise would be conducted through a pattern of racketeering activity and that to accomplish the goal and purpose of the Enterprise, at least two predicate acts by the conspiracy were contemplated, specifically the daily booting up of Mr. Berry's freight system making an illegal copy in violation of the copyright laws of the United States and the creation of the Dillon derivatives. By these acts, C&S and all other non-bankrupt defendants have

violated RICO 18 U.S.C. §1962(d). The agreement is also, in part, evidenced by the asset purchase agreement and other documents related to the sale.

- 144. All the money derived by C&S from infringement that is derived from the infringement of Mr. Berry's intellectual property constitutes a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956 that prohibits the laundering of monetary instruments regarding funds derived from copyright infringement.
- 145. Fleming had a finding of liability on a RICO predicate on March 6, 2003 and the most recent predicate offense occurred the last time the Dillon derivative of Mr. Berry's system was used. There were predicate acts too numerous to be contained in a short plain statement. At least from January 2000 to the present no less than 10,000 separate acts of criminal infringement related to the illegal use of Mr. Berry's system have transpired.
- 146. Each use of the Dillon derivatives constitutes a separate predicate act of Copyright Infringement in violation of the Copyright Act 17 U.S.C. § 506(a) and 18 U.S.C. § 2319.
- Additional predicate offenses shall be set forth in the RICO 147. statement, incorporated by this reference.
- 148. Plaintiff has standing to proceed because it has been injured in its business or property by reason of a violation of section 1962 of RICO and may sue

therefor in any appropriate United States district court and shall recover threefold the damages sustained and the cost of the suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees and the costs of bringing suit.

Plaintiff also gives notice of his intent to seek costs and attorney's 149. fees as provided by law for both willful and malicious trade secret misappropriation and for the violation of his copyrights.

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

- 150. Based on the threat of continued violation of the copyright laws, misappropriation of trade secrets by its unauthorized use and transfers of unauthorized copies to third parties through application sharing technology or otherwise, Plaintiff is suffering irreparable injury and, because HEX, HEST and CALPAC have no lawful right to use the Freight Control System. Plaintiff has a strong likelihood of success on the merits and seeks a preliminary injunction as follows:
- preliminary injunction against all defendants and anyone claiming a. any rights to use the software derived from Mr. Berry's original work,
- b. impoundment of the infringing software during the pendency of this litigation,
 - preliminary injunction against infringing of the copyright, c.

- seizure of all computer files derived from the infringement. e.
- f. a temporary and permanent injunction against all defendants. including Fleming, Christensen, Dillon, Noa, C&S, Guidance, ES3, Cohen and certain Doe Defendants to prohibit the creation of any additional freight control software including, but not limited to, derivatives of Mr. Berry's original work and to prohibit the use of any such infringing software.
- g. an order permanently prohibiting Noa and Dillon and certain Doe defendants for conducting any business related to the shipment of goods. temporary and permanent injunction against C&S and anyone claiming rights under it for misappropriation of Plaintiff's Trade Secrets including Mark Dillon and Teresa Noa and that Plaintiff or his agents or Court appointed agents be permitted to inspect the defendant's business premises during normal business hours to verify that defendant's have complied with the Court's injunction.

WHEREFORE PLAINTIFF PRAYS FOR:

A. A temporary and permanent injunction directed to Defendants, and any agent or bailee of Defendants, as set forth herein and in the accompanying Motion, from using any software derived in part from the source code of Plaintiff's software as evidenced by the registration of copyrights;

- B. An order authorizing Plaintiff and or the United States Marshall or his/her Deputy to enter upon Defendants' or their agents' and/or bailees' premises and to enter upon the defendant's property and take possession of all software and data derived from the software that relates in any way to the software that is the subject of this case;
- C. Damages for infringement of the copyright as provided by the Copyright Act without limitation against all non-bankrupt defendants and against all bankrupts from and after the date of their bankruptcy filing including actual damages and accounting for all gains and profits derived by non-bankrupt defendants through infringement of copyright including a detailed accounting of all non-bankrupt corporate and individual defendants' revenues produced from November 1, 1999 to the date of the order or the date that the infringement ceased, which ever is later;
- D. Damages, including exemplary damages, against all defendants. including, but not limited to, C&S, Guidance, Guidance, Gurzi, Noa and Dillon for misappropriation of Mr. Berry's trade secrets plus attorneys fees and costs.
- E. Delivery by Defendant of all copies of the offending software and all data created and the database associated with the software for destruction:
 - F. Payment of the costs of the action and reasonable attorney's fees at rates

paid to the attorney for the opposing parties;

- G. The trebling of all damages for violations of RICO and/or the Clayton Act;
 - H. Exemplary damages as provided by Hawaii Uniform Trade Secrets Act.
- I. A liquidation of all damages for all acts by Fleming from April 1, 2004 to the date of trial with no execution thereon without further order of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, and

J. Such other and further relief as may be just.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, JUN 1 8 2004

Attorney for Plain of WAYNE BERRY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

WAYNE BERRY, a Hawaii citizen;) Civ. No. CV03 00385 SOM-LEK (Copyright)
Plaintiff,)
,) VERIFICATION
VS.)
•	í
HAWAIIAN EXPRESS SERVICE,)
INC., a California corporation; H.E.S.) ·
TRANSPORTATION SERVICES,)
INC., a California corporation;)
CALIFORNIA PACIFIC)
CONSOLIDATORS, INC., a)
California corporation; JEFFREY P.)
GRAHAM and PETER SCHAUL,)
California citizens; MARK DILLON)
and TERESA NOA, BRIAN)
CHRISTENSEN, Hawaii citizens;)
FLEMING COMPANIES, INC., an)
Oklahoma corporation; C & S)
LOGISTICS OF HAWAII, LLC, a)
Delaware LLC; C & S WHOLESALE)
GROCERS, INC., a Vermont)
corporation;)
C & S ACQUISITIONS, LLC;)
FOODLAND SUPER MARKET,)
LIMITED, a Hawaii corporation;)
HAWAII TRANSFER COMPANY, 📑)
LIMITED, a Hawaii Corporation,	
RICHARD COHEN, a New Hampshire))
citizen ES3, LLC, a Delaware Limited)	
Liability Company, MELVIN PONCE,)	•
SONIA PURDY, JUSTIN)	
FUKUMOTO, AFREDDA)	
WAIOLAMA JACOLIELINE RIO	

JUN 1 8 2004

Hawaii citizens; JESSIE GONZALES	,
LUIZ RODRIGUES, AL PEREZ and	,
PATRICK HIRAYAMA, California	
citizens; GUIDANCE SOFTWARE,)
LLC, a Delaware, LLC; MICHAEL)
GURZI, a California citizen; ALIX)
PARTNERS, LLC a Delaware, LLC;)
DOE INDIVIDUALS 2-350; DOE)
PARTNERSHIPS, CORPORATIONS)
and OTHER DOE ENTITIES 2-20,)
)
Defendants.)
•)

VERIFICATION

I, WAYNE BERRY, have read the foregoing Complaint; Exhibit "A", the facts and the allegations stated herein are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. The document attached as Exhibit "A" is a true and correct copy of my business records kept in the regular course of business.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18th day of

Notary Public, State of Hawaii

My commission expires: 3/18/2005

Using the way is a more than every south of the most control of the transfer of the work likely for a distribution of the transfer for the work likely and a notific of the transfer that went tooks has been able to war and of which the transfer of the

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION

F. RM TX For a Nondramatic Literary Work UNITED STATES COPYRIGHT OFFICE



TX 5-079-445

			Horth Day ve
11.0	DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS L	INE. IF YOU NEED WORE SPACE, USE A SEPARAT	TE CONTINUATION SHEET.
	TITLE OF THIS WORK ▼		Committee of the second
	Freight Control System		
	PREVIOUS OR ALTERNATIVE	E TITLES ▼	
	PUBLICATION AS A CONTRICON OF CONTRICON	BUTION If this work was published as a contribution to a po- tion appeared. Title of Collective Work ▼	eriodical, senal, or collection, give information about
	If published in a periodical or serial g	vc Volume♥ Number♥	Issue Date ♥ On Pages ♥
	NAME OF AUTHOR ▼		DATES OF BIRTH AND DEATH
a	4		Year Born ▼ Year Died ▼ 1955
	Was this contribution to the work a "work made for hire"?	AUTHOR'S NATIONALITY OR DOMICILE	WAS THIS AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION THE WORK
	⊖ Yes	OR Cutizen of USA	— Anonymous DYcs K No Yes see
	NATHE OF AUTHORSHIP	Damic iled to	— Pseudonymous? DYrs DNe restudior
E	Computer Program	riofly describe nature of material created by this author in which	ch copyright is claimed. 🔻
· 1	NAME OF AUTHOR ▼		DATES OF BIRTH AND DEATH Year Bom ▼ Year Died ▼
he ngi e.e	Was this contribution to the work a "work made for hire"?	AUTHOR'S NATIONALITY OR DOMICILE	WAS THIS AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION THE WORK
e #ny	⊖ Yes	OR Catizon of	- Anonymous? Tyes I No Was an
r 2 9	<u>UNo</u>	Domested in	 Pseudonymous? — Yes — No instruction
65 65	NATURE OF AUTHORSHIP Br	icfly describe nature of material created by this author in whic	h copyright is claimed. 🔻
44	NAME OF AUTHOR ▼		DATES OF BIRTH AND DEATH
" C			Year Born ▼ Year Died ▼
rork •d) ol	Was this contribution to the work a "work made for here"?	AUTHOR'S NATIONALITY OR DOMICILE	WAS THIS AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION THE WORK
nd .	DYA .	OR CHIECO OF	Anonymous? TYOS O No TYPE AND
ates	<u>UN6</u>	Domesical in	- Pseudonymous? TYes L No instruction
	NATURE OF AUTHORSHIP Bri YEAR IN WHICH CREATION O	efly describe nature of material created by this author in which FTHIS DATE AND NATION OF FIRST PLE	n copyright is claimed ▼ BLICATION OF THIS PARTICULAR WOR
a	WORK WAS COMPLETED THE	information Complete the information Month 11 ORLY If the work tases. has been published. USA	Dayle 27 Year 95
	the author given in space 2. *	no and address must be given even if the claimant is the same	"> vibration decetaeo
	Wayne Foster Berry		ONE DEPOSIT RECEIVED
	425 South Street, #2603 A		
rs	425 South Street, #2603 A Honolulu, Hawaii 96813		TWO DEPOSITS RECEIVED
ors otno	Honofulu, Hawaii 96813 TRANSFER If the claimant(s) named	here in space 4 is (are) different from the author(s) named in e-claimant(s) obtained ownership of the copyright.	TWO DEPOSIT RECEIVED TWO DEPOSITS RECEIVED TWO DEPOSITS RECEIVED TWO DEPOSITS RECEIVED

MORE ON BACK • . Complete all applicable apaces (numbers 5.9) on the reverse aide of this page - See detailed instructions • Sign the form at kno 8

DO NOT WHITE HERE
Page 1 of Capes



EXAMINED BY CHECKED BY	from p. e.	FORM TX
CORRESPONDENCE		FOR COPYRIGH OFFICE
		USE ONLY

	CORRESPONDENCE	FOR
	Yes	COPYRIGH
	163	OFFICE USE
		ONLY
DO NOT WRITE ABOVE THIS LINE. IF YOU NEED MORE SPACE	CE, USE A SEPARATE CONTINUATION SHEET.	
PREVIOUS REGISTRATION Has registration for this work or for an earlier version		prov
○ Yes ○ No. If your answer is "Yes," why is another registration being sought? (Check a		lien
This is the first published edition of a work previously registered in unpublished form	ti	6
b. This is the first application submitted by this author as copyright claimant.		
e. C This is a changed version of the work, as shown by space 6 on this application		
If your answer is "Yes," give. Previous Registration Number. ▶	Year of Registration ▶	
DERIVATIVE WORK OR COMPILATION Preexisting Material Identify any precusting work or works that this work is based on or	incorporates ▼	11 6
Material Added to This Work. Give a brief, general statement of the material that has been	added to this work and in which copyright is claimed. ▼	See instructions before completin the space
DEPOSIT ACCOUNT. If the registration for is to be charged to a Deposit Account estal Name V	blished in the Copyright Office, give name and number of Account.	11 1
CORRESPONDENCE Give name and address to which correspondence about this app Wayne Foster Berry 425 South Street, #2603 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813	olication should be sent. — Name/Address/Api/City/State/7.IP ♥	1)
Area code and deytime telephone number > 808-545-5817 Email > WayneB@pxg.com	Fax number ▶ 808-545-5837	
CERTIFICATION* 1, the underugned, hereby certify that Lam the	alliquita que altinutario ne la Colo nia de Palacia, i que minera de 2000 a 1500 a 15	e is
	opyright cialmant	
CIRCHOID OIL FR	of exclusive right(s)	6.3
of the work identified in this application and that the statements made	zed agent of	450
by me in this application are correct to the best of my knowledge.	Name of author or other copyright claimant, or owner of exclusive right(s) &	
Typed or printed name and date \forall if this application gives a date of publication in space 3,		
Wayne Foster Berry	Date 9-27-99	190
X — Wayur D		
A 40	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	P. C.
Certificate Name V will be Wayne Foster Berry	Complete all necessary spaces Sign your application in space 8	3.3
malled in	NAME OF THE PARTY	
window Number/Street/Apt V	Application form Nonrefundable filing lee in chock or	or imponent order As of
envelope to this 425 South Street, #2603 A	psystes to Register of Copyrights 3 Dispose material	July 1. 1999,
eddress: Cty/Sule/ZP ▼	Lorary of Congress	the
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813	Copyright Office Copyright Office 131 Independence Avenue S.E. Washington, D.C. 20559-6000	fee for Form TX In \$30 Cross on interest thereto

*17 U.S.C. § 506(e) Any person who knowingly makes a labe representation of a makenal fact in the application for copyright registration provided for by section 405 or in any written statement field in connection with the application, shall be fined not more than \$2,500.

OFFICE 1989-454-87949

OFFICE 1989-454-87949

OFFICE 1989-454-87949

EU S GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1989-454-879/49

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII

WAYNE BERRY, a Hawaii citizen; Plaintiff,) Civ. No. CV03 00385 SOM-LEK) (Copyright)
vs.) DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL)
HAWAIIAN EXPRESS SERVICE,)
INC., a California corporation; H.E.S. TRANSPORTATION SERVICES,)
INC., a California corporation;	
CALIFORNIA PACIFIC CONSOLIDATORS, INC., a)
California corporation; JEFFREY P.)
GRAHAM and PETER SCHAUL,)
California citizens; MARK DILLON and TERESA NOA, BRIAN)
CHRISTENSEN, Hawaii citizens;)
FLEMING COMPANIES, INC., an)
Oklahoma corporation; C & S LOGISTICS OF HAWAII, LLC, a)
Delaware LLC; C & S WHOLESALE)
GROCERS, INC., a Vermont)
corporation; C & S ACQUISITIONS,)
LLC; FOODLAND SUPER).
MARKET, LIMITED, a Hawaii corporation; HAWAII TRANSFER)
COMPANY, LIMITED, a Hawaii)
Corporation, RICHARD COHEN, a)
New Hampshire citizen ES3, LLC, a)
Delaware Limited Liability Company,	
MELVIN PONCE, SONIA PURDY, JUSTIN FUKUMOTO, AFREDDA)
WAIOLAMA, JACQUELINE RIO,)
Hawaii citizens; JESSIE GONZALES,	,)
LUIZ RODRIGUES, AL PEREZ and)

PATRICK HIRAYAMA, California	`
citizens; GUIDANCE SOFTWARE,	,
LLC, a California, LLC; MICHAEL)
GURZI, a California citizen; ALIX)
PARTNERS, LLC, a Delaware LLC;	
DOE INDIVIDUALS 2-350; DOE)
PARTNERSHIPS, CORPORATIONS)
and OTHER DOE ENTITIES 2-20,)
)
Defendants.)
	١

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Wayne Berry hereby respectfully demands a trial by jury of all

issues triable thereto.

Dated: Honolulu, Hawaii, _____

TIMOTHY J. HOG

JUN 1 8 2004

Attorney for Plaintiff WAYNE BERRY

AO 440 (Rev. 10/93) Summons in a Civil Action

United States District Court

DISTRICT OF

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL CASE

Wayne Berry

٧.

CASE NO.: Civil. No. CV03-00385 SOM LEK

Hawaiian Express Service, Inc. et. al,

TO: (Name and address of defendant)

Above-Named Defendants

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED of required to serve upon PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY (name and address)

Lynch Ichida Thompson Kim & Hirota TIMOTHY J. HOGAN 5312-0 1132 Bishop Street Suite 1405 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Phone: 808-528-0100 Fax: 808-528-4997 Attorney for Wayne F Berry Plaintiff(s)

Second Amended Verified an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within Twenty (20) days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You must also file your answer with the Clerk of this Court within a reasonable period of time after service.

JUN 1 9 2904

DATE

(BY) DEPUTY CLERK